

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 30, 2007, claims 1 and 4-12 were rejected. Additionally, claims 7 and 8 were objected to. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the new claims 13-25 and the below-provided remarks. Claims 1-12 are canceled.

For reference, new claims 13-25 are supported throughout the specification. In particular, claim 13 is supported by original claims 1-3. Claim 14 is also supported by original claim 2. Claims 15 and 16 are supported by original claims 7 and 8. Claim 17 is supported by original claim 3. Claims 18-20 are supported by original claims 4-6. Claims 21-24 are supported by original claims 9-12. Claim 25 is supported by original claim 1.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action states that Figure 4 should include a legend to designate the illustrated subject matter as prior art. Accordingly, Figure 4 is amended to include a legend to designate the illustrated subject matter as prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Figure 4 be withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification

The disclosure is objected to because the specification refers to “the preamble of claim 1.” Applicants submit that the specification is amended to delete the reference to the preamble of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

The Office Action also suggests that section headings be added to the specification, according to the guidelines set forth in the MPEP. Applicants note that the suggested section headings are not required and, hence, Applicants respectfully decline to amend the specification to include the indicated section headings.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 8 were objected to because of informalities. In particular, claim 7 was objected to for use of the term “substantial,” instead of “substantially.” Similarly, claim 8 was objected to for reference to “an fraction,” instead of “a fraction.” Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 8 are canceled and, hence, the objections to claims 7 and 8 are moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 7, 8, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 8, and 10 are canceled and, hence, these rejections are moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action states that claims 2, 3, and 8 recite allowable subject matter. As a preliminary matter, while the Office Action provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, the Office Action’s statement is directed to specific aspects of certain claims and not necessarily all of the claims. Applicants note that the Office Action’s comments may have paraphrased the language of the claims and it should be understood that the language of the claims themselves set out the scope of the claims. Thus, it is noted that the claim language should be viewed in light of the exact language of the claim rather than any paraphrasing or implied limitations thereof.

Although claims 2, 3, and 8 are canceled, allowable subject matter from claims 2 and 3 is recited in the new independent claim 13. In particular, claim 13 recites “means for tuning at least one of said anti-resonance frequencies or one of said resonance frequencies of the resonator elements, wherein the means for tuning at least one of said anti-resonance frequencies comprises a capacitance C connected to each of said resonator elements” (emphasis added). Furthermore, dependent claim 14 recites the remaining limitations of claim 2, dependent claim 17 recites the remaining limitations of claim 3, and dependent 16 recites the remaining limitations of claim 8.

Since claim 13 recites allowable subject matter from canceled claims 2 and 3, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is also allowable and patentable over the

cited references. Given that claims 14-25 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 13, Applicants respectfully assert claims 14-25 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 14-25 may be allowable for further reasons. For example, dependent claims 14, 16, and 17 are allowable because they recite allowable subject matter from canceled claims 2, 8, and 3, respectively.


CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the new claims presented and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Date: 8-22-2007

Respectfully submitted,


Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111